

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

LAW OFFICES

JUN U 3 2004

GIFFORD, KRASS, GROH, SPRINKLE, ANDERSON & CITKOWSKI, P.C.

PATENT, TRADEMARK AND COPYRIGHT PRACTICE

101 N. MAIN STREET SUITE 800

ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN 48104-1476

(734) 913-9300 FACSIMILE (734) 913-6007 jposa@patlaw.com dwathen@patlaw.com

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

DATE:

June 3, 2004

TO:

EXAMINER JOSEPH PAPE

FACSIMILE NO.:

703-872-9306

FROM:

Douglas L. Wathen

PAGES TRANSMITTED (INCLUDING COVER SHEET):

.

ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS WILL ____ / WILL NOT ___ X FOLLOW BY MAIL

RE:

SN 10/676,741

MESSAGE:

Information contained in this facsimile may be PRIVILEGED and CONFIDENTIAL. It is intended only for the use of the person or entity formed above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is neither intended nor permissible. If this facsimile has been received in error, please notify us immediately (call collect) and return the facsimile to us.

13:30



JUN 0 3 2004

Attorney Docket No. KMN-10702/16

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:

Reinhard Wolfgang Quindt

Serial No.:

10/676,741

Group Art Unit: 3612

Filing Date:

October 1, 2003

Examiner: Joseph Pape

For:

STE. 400. BIRMINGHAM, MICHIGAN 48008-5384 (248) 647-6000

CONVERTIBLE ROOF ROADSTER

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In response to the Restriction Requirement mailed May 4, 2004, Applicant elects the version of the present invention shown in Figures 19-33. Independent claim 1 is directed to the version of the invention in Figures 19-33. Dependent claims 2-10 depend from independent claim 1, and should be considered therewith. However, certain features of some of these claims are not illustrated in these specific figures. For examples, Figures 19-33 do not illustrate the flexible membrane of claims 2 and 3 and the rear window of claims 5-8.

Independent claim 11 also reads on the version of the invention shown in Figures 19-33. Claims 12-16 depend from independent claim 11 and should be considered therewith. However, certain aspects of the dependent claims 12-15 are not shown in these specific figures.

Independent claim 17 is a method claim also directed to the version of the invention shown in Figures 19-33. Claims 18 and 19 depend from claim 17 and should be considered therewith. Any questions should be directed to Applicant's below signed representative.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 3, 2004

GROH, SPRINKLE,

Douglas Wathen Registration No. 41,369

Gifford, Krass, Groh, Sprinkle, Anderson & Citkowski, P.C.

280 N. Old Woodward, Suite 400

Birmingham, MI 48009

(734) 913-9300